

U.S. Department of Education
2015 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [] Title I [] Charter [] Magnet [] Choice

Name of Principal Mr. John Gillette

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Forest Grove Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1645 32nd Avenue

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Hudsonville State MI Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 49426-9628

County Ottawa County State School Code Number* 01263

Telephone 616-896-9429 Fax _____

Web site/URL http://www.hudsonville.k12.mi.us E-mail jgillette@hpseagles.net

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Dr. Nicholas Ceglarek

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr.,

E-mail: nceglar@hpseagles.net

Other)

District Name Hudsonville Public Schools Tel. 616-669-1740

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board

President/Chairperson Mr. Ken Hall

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school’s application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below, concerning the school’s eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education and National Blue Ribbon Schools requirements, are true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as “persistently dangerous” within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state’s AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2014-2015 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2009 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014.
7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school’s application and/or rescind a school’s award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution’s equal protection clause.
11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):
- 7 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 2 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 1 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 10 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- ☐ Urban or large central city
 - ☐ Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
 - ☐ Suburban
 - ☐ Small city or town in a rural area
 - ☒ Rural
3. 7 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|----------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| K | 29 | 23 | 52 |
| 1 | 25 | 14 | 39 |
| 2 | 24 | 29 | 53 |
| 3 | 25 | 27 | 52 |
| 4 | 15 | 29 | 44 |
| 5 | 26 | 25 | 51 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Students | 152 | 152 | 304 |

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 1 % Asian
 - 3 % Black or African American
 - 4 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 92 % White
 - 0 % Two or more races
 - 100 % Total**

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2013 - 2014 year: 7%

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

| Steps For Determining Mobility Rate | Answer |
|--|--------|
| (1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2013 until the end of the school year | 14 |
| (2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2013 until the end of the school year | 7 |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 21 |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 300 |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | 0.070 |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 7 |

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 1 %
2 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 1
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 17 %
 Total number students who qualify: 49

Information for Public Schools Only - Data Provided by the State

The state has reported that 24 % of the students enrolled in this school are from low income or disadvantaged families based on the following subgroup(s): Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals

9. Students receiving special education services: 8 %
26 Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>1</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>4</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>4</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>1</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>16</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>0</u> Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed |

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

| | Number of Staff |
|--|-----------------|
| Administrators | 1 |
| Classroom teachers | 13 |
| Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc. | 3 |
| Paraprofessionals | 3 |
| Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc. | 0 |

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 23:1

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

| Required Information | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 93% | 96% | 97% | 95% | 97% |
| High school graduation rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2014

| Post-Secondary Status | |
|---|----|
| Graduating class size | 0 |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | 0% |
| Enrolled in a community college | 0% |
| Enrolled in career/technical training program | 0% |
| Found employment | 0% |
| Joined the military or other public service | 0% |
| Other | 0% |

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.

Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

15. Please summarize your school mission in 25 words or less: Our school mission is to educate, challenge and inspire all learners to become contributing, responsible members of a global society.

PART III – SUMMARY

Forest Grove Elementary School finds its home in the Hudsonville Public School District which is located in Ottawa County in West Michigan. Forest Grove is one of seven elementary schools in the district and is the most rural and the smallest. We provide high quality instruction for approximately 304 students PreK-5th grade. Forest Grove serves a predominantly caucasian (92%) community with 24% of our students being economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, English language learners or migrant. In the late 1950's, Forest Grove School became a part of the Hudsonville Public School system and the current building we call home was built in 1958. Since this time, three major renovations and additions have occurred making it the building that it is today. The school has experienced slow yet steady growth over the past seven years. A unique aspect of our school's population is that 23-25% of our enrollment is made up of both Schools Of Choice and In-District Transfer students. This extremely high percentage compared with county-wide data is a direct result of our reputation, values, and the continued success of our students. We continue to strive to maintain the small school and small town feeling amongst our school families and our community despite being a part of a very large and rapidly growing school district.

Our mission is to educate, challenge and inspire all learners to become contributing, responsible members of a global society. Through our daily instruction, we celebrate the uniqueness of each individual. We enable all students and staff to achieve their highest potential through mutual respect and various learning opportunities in a warm, nurturing environment with the support of school, home, and community.

Forest Grove Elementary regularly reviews its curriculum practices and makes adjustments based on data from both district and state assessments. Researched best practices, based on Marzano's strategies for effective instruction, are used each day and monitored by administration. Differentiated groups are used to best meet the needs of all students and provide an engaging, challenging and meaningful curriculum. Capturing Kids Hearts strategies are used daily to build community and relationships with a safe, caring, and supportive environment. Each staff member holds the mindset that with the right instruction, classroom environment, and support, every student is capable of learning at high levels. We continue to have a very active Parent-Teacher Club that provides volunteers and funds for many student and school community events. They also provide additional funding to support learning activities by purchasing instructional supplies and technology. Parents at Forest Grove volunteer hundreds of hours per year to work in our classrooms and our school.

Students at Forest Grove Elementary continue to perform at high levels on local, state and national assessments. Hudsonville Public Schools is one of the leading districts in West Michigan for academic performance, with Forest Grove helping to lead our district in standardized achievement results for many years in a row. Many of our resources are used to help our at-risk students achieve at higher levels. This has been a continuing challenge as our district has had to tighten its budget in recent years. Differentiated instruction, tiers of intervention support with creative scheduling, lesson planning and learning activities have been employed to reach our bottom 30% of students within the school setting with tremendous success.

Forest Grove Elementary has been recognized by the Michigan Department of Education as a "High Performing School" in 2013-14 and 2014-15 and a "Beating the Odds School" in 2013-14 and 2014-15. We have also earned a "Reward School" status (96th or higher percentile among MI schools) in 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. We believe that this recognition is a direct result of our staff collaboration on best practices, engaged and motivated students, and partnerships with parents and families. Staff members take incredible responsibility for teaching and reaching all students and are committed to consistent data review, spiraling of curriculum across all grade levels, and concerted effort placed on school improvement practices. These improvement strategies are implemented with fidelity, monitored for effectiveness, and drive instructional practices across all grade levels.

To help support and encourage student success, we embrace many opportunities to help our students achieve high levels of success both academically and socially. Some of these activities include: a school- wide character education program that addresses problem solving, bullying, positive choices, etc., summer reading initiatives, an online after-school reading program for at-risk students, Girls on the Run program to

promote positive choices and self-esteem, S.A.V.E. (a substance abuse violence education program for fifth graders), Hand2Hand Programming, Children's Advocacy Center presentations, school and classroom celebrations of learning, Kids Hope USA mentoring program, and multi-age school Friendship Teams that meet to promote citizenship and community.

PART IV – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Core Curriculum:

Forest Grove's curriculum is aligned to Michigan's State Standards, with common pacing, learning targets, assessments and resources used to create a guaranteed and viable curriculum. Enrichment and intervention is used throughout the curriculum to meet the needs of individual students and a spiraled K-12 curriculum is utilized to ensure a growth continuum resulting in students who are ultimately prepared to take on the challenges of college and career.

English Language Arts

English Language Arts instruction is aligned to the Common Core standards. Our staff utilizes a researched based approach for instruction in both reading and writing through a workshop model. In kindergarten through second grades, at least 90 minutes each day is dedicated to foundational reading skills in the areas of comprehension, accuracy, and fluency. Third through fifth grades devote 60 minutes to applying these skills and developing higher level thinking strategies. Students are also engaged in 60 minutes of writing daily. Writing instruction gives students opportunities to develop and structure content within narrative, informational, and opinion genres.

Both reading and writing workshops begin with short, focused mini-lessons that present clear learning objectives based on grade level standards. These lessons incorporate authentic texts from a variety of genres and include teacher modeling and active engagement for students to practice skills before independently reading or writing. Teachers confer with students during independent reading and writing to formatively assess understanding of the learning objectives, as well as to provide individualized instruction and support as needed. Flexible small groups are convened to address specific needs that enable students to meet grade level expectations. Teachers regularly administer benchmark assessments to provide information that guides daily instruction, determining necessary interventions for at-risk and advanced students. All students are provided additional instruction and practice through instructional paraprofessional support, Reading Counts and Raz Kids programs, Kids' Hope mentors, and peer tutoring.

Mathematics

Our daily math instruction is a 60-90 minute block of time. During this time, students take part in a lesson, guided and independent practice, fact fluency practice, assessments, and interventions. The Math Expressions program is our primary resource, with supplemental materials used as needed to meet the standards.

All grade levels emphasize problem-solving methodology and encourage students to explain their thinking through "math talk" and written constructed responses. To solve problems, students utilize number sense in addition and subtraction in the lower elementary levels and multiplication and division in the upper levels. Formative and summative assessments are used consistently to determine student understanding. Data from these assessments is used to create flexible groups and interventions.

Science

Science instruction includes units in the disciplines of Science Processes, Physical Science, Life Science, and Earth Science. The instruction of these units spirals from kindergarten through fifth grade. As a way to emphasize important science vocabulary, all staff compiled and shared science vocabulary that would be consistently taught throughout all grades. It is our expectation that students will utilize these words to increase their depth of knowledge. Informational reading and writing are integrated within this content area. Common district assessments are administered at the completion of each unit.

Social Studies

Each grade level focuses on the social studies strands of history, geography, civics, economics, and public discourse within their particular focus. Kindergarten focuses on relationships with others; first grade expands that to families and school; second grade moves beyond that to the local community; third grade focuses on Michigan studies; fourth grade takes a regional look at the modern United States. This all

culminates in fifth grade with a historical focus on the United States. Informational reading and writing are integrated within this content area. Common assessments are administered at the completion of each unit.

2. Other Curriculum Areas:

Our music, art, and physical education programs are standards-based and focus on skills to help students be well-rounded. Our students showcase their musical skills to our community twice a year; at our holiday program and our Memorial Day program. A noteworthy experience for our students and families is our annual Art Showcase. This is a time for exemplary artwork to be displayed at the Hudsonville City Hall. Students have the opportunity to participate in our school's running club which meets twice a week to train for the Eagle 5K held in our community. At the district level, each subject has developed a sequential curriculum within the state framework. These courses and their content also fall under the oversight of our school-wide improvement goals and strategy implementation plans, individual teacher development goals, teacher evaluation guidelines, and research-based best practice strategies. Pre-kindergarten through fifth grade students participate in art, music, and physical education classes for 50 minutes a class on a three-day rotation. This results in 100 minutes of instruction for every six days of school.

Technology standards are currently taught by classroom teachers during scheduled computer class times. State technology standards are divided into kindergarten through second and third through fifth strands. Students use technology to collaborate and communicate, to reinforce basic skills in content areas, for research and problem-solving, completing assessments, and critical thinking. Pre-kindergarten through second grade students spend approximately 60 minutes per week, while third through fifth grade students spend approximately 120-180 minutes per week using technology as a whole group. Individual classrooms and/or students utilize our school's laptops, iPads, iPods, and Apple TVs on a daily basis.

One unique area of our school-wide instruction is our focus on character education. This is taught formally through our school's Friendship Teams. These are multi-age groups of students (pre-kindergarten through fifth grade) assigned to a staff member. Students are instructed about topics like anti-bullying, positive social skills, conflict-resolution, etc. School Friendship Teams meet monthly to read and discuss the book, *The 7 Habits of Happy Kids* by Sean Covey. Students then participate in fun and educational activities that reinforce the concepts described in the book and promote citizenship and community service. One example of this is when our school participated in the international program, Feed My Starving Children. The students worked along side adults to hand-pack meals specifically formulated for malnourished children that were then shipped to nearly 70 countries around the world. Another example is our annual Physical Education Cares food drive. Students are challenged to donate nonperishable food items that would then bless others in our community.

3. Instructional Methods and Interventions:

Forest Grove is dedicated to providing opportunities to ensure that all students can be successful learners. With our diverse academic population, Forest Grove differentiates instruction, seeking to tailor the curriculum to provide opportunities encouraging success.

Our dedicated staff is committed to differentiating instruction based on formative and summative assessment data. Continuous monitoring of student progress and flexible grouping allows teachers to provide optimal instruction across content areas. Based on individual needs, students are instructed in differentiated academic groups including one-on-one instruction, small group, whole group, adjustable grouping, similar ability, and mixed ability.

Our workshop model for reading and writing offers a climate optimal for differentiation to meet the needs of all learners. Conferencing with students within the workshop model allows teachers to meet individual needs by reteaching and/or providing enrichment opportunities. Students are offered exposure to content through multiple learning styles that are addressed through various techniques including opportunities involving: technology, kinesthetic, rhythm, tactile, and auditory and visual strategies. In addition to core instruction, reading support services are offered for students in grades kindergarten through fifth. Math differentiation is approached in many different ways to accommodate the needs of each grade level. Grade level examples

include: leveled math groups, differentiated activities based on the level of need, peer-tutoring, exit tickets, independent practice to solidify students' understanding, as well as enrichment opportunities. Math intervention, offered across grade levels, reinforces math skills to support student learning.

Forest Grove incorporates technology in various formats across the curriculum. Technology continues to play an increasing role in curriculum as teachers utilize multiple resources (Apple TV, iPads, blogs, laptops, iPods, document cameras) to enhance instruction. Students use technology to create projects, assimilate information, present skills, conduct research, foster communication, and complete online assessments.

At Forest Grove, we strive to present opportunities for all children to reach their potential through meaningful curriculum and effective pedagogy. We recognize that each child comes to school with varying readiness skills, learning styles, levels of knowledge and life experiences. This inspires us to continue to evolve our differentiation opportunities, promoting life-long learners and responsible citizens.

PART V – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results Narrative Summary:

Our students have performed exceptionally well on standardized assessments. They have consistently scored significantly above the state average scores on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) in the areas of math, reading, writing, and science. These state assessments are given in third through fifth grade and are based on state standards. The MEAP performance levels are: (1) Advanced, (2) Proficient, (3) Partially Proficient, (4) Not Proficient. Our passing scores reflect students who have scored at levels 1 and 2, showing a strong understanding of state content expectations.

The five-year data trend shows the results of the high expectations set for every student, as well as the effective instruction that occurs at Forest Grove. With consistently high scores, we have not seen significant gains or losses. A slight decline was noted in scores in 2011-12 when the State of Michigan changed the cut scores in both math and ELA. Although this resulted in a decrease in scores, our students still scored 21% higher in reading and 39% higher in math compared to the state average. Since the implementation of the new cut scores, there is evidence of a positive trajectory in student scores. District curriculum changes that required re-aligning new curriculum to state expectations may have contributed to the minimal decline in test scores. Gains in high performance can be attributed to the implementation of a school-wide intervention block, common planning time among grade level peers to review data and to make instructional decisions based on student needs, and a focus on daily high quality instruction. Recently, there has not been a gap of 10 or more percentage points between test scores of all students and subgroups.

Our challenge has been to maintain high levels of achievement. Staff members meet regularly to analyze data and use this information to drive instruction. School improvement is our major focus. Each teacher plays an integral role in periodically reviewing, interpreting, analyzing, setting priorities, and developing strategies to improve curriculum and instruction. The overriding purpose of this teamwork is to enhance student achievement while building character and developing a sense of belonging and community.

2. Assessment for Instruction and Learning and Sharing Assessment Results:

Our staff reviews data compiled from classroom, district, and state assessments to help all learners reach their highest potential. In the fall, grade levels meet to share and discuss assessment data from the previous year. In reading, we use district provided assessments: Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark, DRA Benchmark, and Michigan Literacy Progress Profile. In math, InQwizit, a computerized math screener, and district interim assessments are tools used to alert staff of unmastered standards. Results are used to form flexible groupings of students needing additional support during the RtI block.

The data from ongoing assessments is continually monitored by grade level teams ensuring that classroom-based instruction (Tier 1) meets all students' needs. If it is determined that a student has not mastered the grade level objectives, our school's Child Study Team (psychologist, social worker, speech pathologist, special education teacher, principal, grade level teacher) is consulted for a Tier 2 intervention meeting where ideas for more intensive and specific interventions are generated. Logistics of implementing those strategies are formulated and the student's progress is monitored and shared with the team to readjust the intervention or proceed to Tier 3.

Staff analyzes MEAP results and specifically focuses on items where 30% or more students scored less than proficient. Teachers then modify their instruction for the remainder of the year to assure success for all learners. This item analysis information is also used to adjust our school improvement plan.

Assessment results and students' in-class performances are closely monitored by staff and shared with parents through a variety of means: newsletters, emails, phone calls, report cards, conferences, parent curriculum nights, school and district websites, and our annual report. This sharing and comparison of results gives stakeholders evidence of students' progress.

Part VI School Support

1. School Climate/Culture

Forest Grove prides itself on being a school family with a welcoming, healthy, safe, and academically challenging atmosphere where each child's and staff member's unique potential is reached. Staff, parents, and students partner to establish and sustain a positive school environment where quality interpersonal relationships abound. This is evident through our school being generational; where former students return year after year with their own children.

Our students focus on citizenship through participation in community service projects: Feed My Starving Children, Memorial Day program, a food drive to support local families, Jump Rope for Heart, and building relationships with local retirement community residents. These interactions help students build individual confidence, compassion and empathy for humanity, and a positive perspective on putting others first.

Multi-age Friendship Teams meet regularly to encourage positive character traits and engage in community service activities. Our Mileage Club, Running Club, and Girls on the Run program empowers our students to challenge themselves and to reach individual goals.

Families, staff, and volunteers encourage the positive climate of the school through participation in annual Parent-Teacher Club sponsored activities. The Fall Walk-a-thon promotes good health and serves as a fundraiser to support school needs. A Homecoming Tailgate party and Dinner on Us provide free meals for all families, encouraging fellowship and a sense of school pride. Our Santa Sale gives the opportunity for all students to purchase low-cost, high-quality gifts for their families. Our school carnival, pet day, and year-end picnic offer opportunities to build family-school relationships.

Parent volunteers partner with staff to influence the teaching and learning environment. They are welcomed daily into classrooms to help directly with student academic growth (one-on-one, small groups, and multiple supports of academic programs). They also provide invaluable support for student activities such as chaperones, class parties, recognition program, publishing company, and school-wide initiatives. The countless support roles and responsibilities our volunteers perform help create the positive and supportive environment that exists.

District administrators observed classroom instruction through a day-long Learning Rounds activity and noted both academic excellence and a unique school climate. Climate was emphasized in regard to teacher-student interactions, student respect, and overall student confidence while interacting with adult visitors. Forest Grove offers a welcoming student-focused environment that combines high expectations in a warm, caring atmosphere.

2. Engaging Families and Community

Forest Grove Elementary staff, students, and families have a close working relationship and long-standing commitment to each other and members of the community. This commitment provides our students with many opportunities to enhance learning and to promote personal growth while improving self, school, and community.

Forest Grove Elementary is continually encouraging the relationship between home and school. Studies indicate that this has a direct impact on student self-esteem and achievement. Curriculum night, Parent-Teacher Club, classroom volunteers, parent-teacher conferences, and frequent communication between home and school, are all ways Forest Grove empowers parents to take an active role in their child's educational success. Other opportunities for parents and community members to be involved with our school include school surveys, new family mentoring programs, school carnival, community art show, and music performances that give students opportunities to showcase their knowledge and talents.

By lending their expertise, community businesses and volunteers help Forest Grove staff enhance curriculum in multiple ways. Community firefighters conduct fire safety lessons for our lower elementary students and farmers from the area instruct the students on plants and gardens. Our community police officers and Child Advocacy Council promote personal safety through their SCAN and SAVE programs. Businesses support our students through donations and attendance at school functions, as well as encouraging them by displaying their various art projects throughout the community.

Local, state, and global service learning projects are very important to the staff and students of Forest Grove Elementary. Students learn the importance of thinking beyond themselves to serve others by participating in projects such as Feed My Starving Children, PE Cares Food Drive, Kids Food Basket, and Hand2Hand. By honoring veterans in a Memorial Day program and visiting a local nursing home, the students realize the importance of core democratic values and citizenship. Students are also encouraged to take part in physical fitness groups such as Girls on the Run and the Forest Grove Running Club. These activities contribute to the students' social, emotional, and physical well-being which positively impacts their achievement.

3. Professional Development

At Forest Grove Elementary, we pride ourselves in the ongoing professional development provided by the district to help sustain our highly effective teachers. Each school year, a minimum of five days are devoted to staff development. These days are focused on student learning and achievement strategies.

The district surveys the staff to assist in targeting professional development activities that will be most meaningful and relevant to teachers in their quest to support student achievement. Examples of professional development include: Common Core alignment, monthly grade level collaboration meetings across the district, technology training, and math, reading, and writing workshops provided by our local intermediate school district. Our principal actively participates in researching the latest practices for highly effective teaching and shares these ideas with our staff on a regular basis. Each year we are flexible in identifying different challenges, and utilize professional development opportunities to address, research, and implement teaching strategies to improve the area of focus.

Three years ago, it was noted that our fifth grade MEAP science results were not consistent with our other MEAP scores. As a result, our building focused on enhancing science vocabulary in all grade levels. Each grade level team developed a list of common science vocabulary and shared this list with the entire staff. Due to this extra focus on consistent use of vocabulary, there was a definite increase in the following year's MEAP science scores, demonstrating a correlation between the professional development and student achievement.

This year our building's professional development is focused on student understanding and use of academic vocabulary. This idea surfaced after our second grade students participated in the Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-Step) pilot last spring. Our principal then read Building Academic Vocabulary by Robert Marzano and challenged the staff to systematically and purposefully teach academic vocabulary and connect it with learning objectives. Staff have begun to create vocabulary notebooks or anchor charts that include the academic term, a student-friendly definition, and examples. We are confident that this emphasis on academic vocabulary will benefit all learners.

Forest Grove is committed to growing life-long learners in a professional learning community that draws from many resources.

4. School Leadership

Forest Grove prides itself on being a true professional learning community (PLC). We embrace a shared leadership philosophy, based on trust, professionalism, and best practices both inside and outside of the classroom setting. Members of the teaching and support staff are all involved in the annual school improvement process. All staff participates in annual perception surveys for district and statewide

requirements, collaborate to determine building-wide educational initiatives, learning goals and academic, behavioral, and social priorities/strategies.

Staff rotate bi-annual service on our School Improvement Team which is comprised of grade level and department representatives who are then responsible to disseminate information back to their colleagues. This team provides shared leadership for all staff through the evaluation of yearly performance data and utilizes this information to guide instruction, monitor state compliance data, and create our annual School Improvement Plan, which is submitted to the Michigan Department of Education. This team also organizes and coordinates parent orientation and curriculum nights that involve our families and community. They also serve as the organizers of school programs such as character education, our school-wide initiatives, Friendship Teams, and community outreach service projects.

Professional development is an expectation that is facilitated and embraced by the entire school district: from the central office to district grade level teams, and from the principal to the teachers and support staff. The principal provides vision, leadership, organization, management, and priorities to staff based on researched-based practices, common sense, and a collective set of agreed upon priorities and strategies.

The principal views his role as a servant and educational leader. He supports teachers, students, and parents to help children and staff achieve high levels of success. School leadership is not a top-down structure, but a collaborative approach; one that is built around a common vision, mission, values, and relationships. The staff fully supports the principal knowing decisions are always based on what is best for students.

Teachers understand the importance of working collaboratively to evaluate student data and determine flexible groups, provide validity in assessments, and provide consistency in what they teach on a daily basis. Teachers are expected to utilize common planning time to achieve these goals and work closely with grade level and vertical peers to help students achieve at high levels. Working relationships among staff reveal a high level of trust, comradery, positive peer interaction and friendship.

PART VIII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Subject: <u>Math</u> | Test: <u>Michigan Educational Assessment Program</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>2014</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Michigan Department of Education</u> | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 82 | 79 | 74 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 13 | 18 | 7 | 75 | 74 |
| Number of students tested | 39 | 51 | 43 | 48 | 39 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | 50 | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | 21 | | | |
| Number of students tested | | 14 | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 81 | 83 | 78 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 14 | 20 | 8 | 78 | 74 |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 46 | 37 | 45 | 34 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Subject: <u>Math</u> | Test: <u>Michigan Educational Assessment Program</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>2014</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Michigan Department of Education</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 83 | 77 | 81 | 99 | 100 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 46 | 21 | 23 | 57 | 84 |
| Number of students tested | 46 | 43 | 48 | 40 | 45 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | 100 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | 77 |
| Number of students tested | | | | | 13 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 88 | 76 | 80 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 49 | 24 | 24 | 62 | 87 |
| Number of students tested | 41 | 37 | 45 | 34 | 39 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Subject: <u>Math</u> | Test: <u>Michigan Educational Assessment Program</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>2014</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Michigan Department of Education</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 93 | 83 | 78 | 84 | 96 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 30 | 21 | 5 | 67 | 61 |
| Number of students tested | 43 | 52 | 37 | 46 | 49 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | 80 | | 73 | 100 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | 0 | | 53 | 62 |
| Number of students tested | | 10 | | 15 | 16 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 92 | 81 | 77 | 81 | 92 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 32 | 21 | 6 | 21 | 32 |
| Number of students tested | 37 | 48 | 31 | 48 | 37 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u> | Test: <u>Michigan Educational Assessment Program</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>2014</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Michigan Department of Education</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 92 | 90 | 83 | 100 | 98 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 23 | 27 | 16 | 62 | 62 |
| Number of students tested | 39 | 51 | 43 | 48 | 39 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | 79 | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | 14 | | | |
| Number of students tested | | 14 | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 92 | 91 | 86 | 100 | 97 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 25 | 30 | 19 | 60 | 62 |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 46 | 37 | 45 | 34 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u> | Test: <u>Michigan Educational Assessment Program</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>2014</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Michigan Department of Education</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 100 | 93 | 92 | 94 | 93 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 28 | 19 | 21 | 52 | 66 |
| Number of students tested | 46 | 43 | 48 | 40 | 44 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | 83 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | 42 |
| Number of students tested | | | | | 12 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 100 | 92 | 91 | 97 | 95 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 29 | 22 | 20 | 53 | 74 |
| Number of students tested | 41 | 37 | 45 | 34 | 38 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u> | Test: <u>Michigan Educational Assessment Program</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>2014</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Michigan Department of Education</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 91 | 86 | 84 | 96 | 98 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 42 | 23 | 22 | 76 | 63 |
| Number of students tested | 43 | 52 | 37 | 46 | 49 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | 90 | | 87 | 100 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | 30 | | 47 | 50 |
| Number of students tested | | 10 | | 15 | 16 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 92 | 85 | 84 | 95 | 98 |
| Advanced (Level 1) | 46 | 25 | 23 | 78 | 64 |
| Number of students tested | 37 | 48 | 31 | 41 | 45 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | | | | | |
| Advanced (Level 1) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: